

## REMARKS

This Amendment reflects claims as submitted with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on April 27, 2009, at which time Claims 1-21 were cancelled and Claims 22-40 (as now correctly numbered) were added.

As stated above, Applicants have cancelled Claims 1-21 from further consideration in this application to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims prior to this Amendment is unpatentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims in one or more continuing applications, including claims capturing the subject matter encompassed by Claims 1-21 prior to this Amendment and additional claims.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 3 of the March 3, 2009 Final Office Action, **Claims 1, 8, and 15** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reshef, et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0233581 – “*Reshef*”) in view of *Magdych, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,096,503 – “*Magdych*”). On page 6 of the Final Office Action, **Claims 2, 9, and 16** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reshef* in view of *Magdych* and Applicants Admitted Prior Art (“AAPA”). On page 7 of the Final Office Action, **Claims 2-6, 10-13, and 17-20** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reshef* in view of *Magdych* and further view of *Neelay, et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0064722 – “*Neelay*”). On page 10 of the Final Office Action, **Claims 7, 14, and 21** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reshef* in view of *Magdych* and further view of *Cedar, et al.* (U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0236994 – “*Cedar*”). Claims 1-21 are now cancelled, and thus these rejections are moot.

With respect to exemplary new **Claim 22**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest:

A method comprising:

“generating, by a first vulnerability analysis and fortification (VAF) agent operating in a hardware-based system” (supported in the originally filed specification at paragraph [0030]), “a first process representation of a first process, wherein the first process comprises a series of sequential operations that are represented by multiple nodes in the first process representation, and wherein the first VAF agent monitors the first process for security exposures;” (supported in paragraph [0015] of the originally filed specification)

“defining legal and illegal interfaces between the multiple nodes in the first process representation, wherein a legal interface between a first node and a second node in the first process representation reflects an authorization for operations represented by the first node and the second node to be linked, and wherein an illegal interface reflects a lack of authorization for operations represented by the first node and the second node to ever be directly linked;” (supported in paragraph [0015])

“generating, by a second VAF agent, a second process representation of a second process;” (supported in paragraph [0015])

“comparing nodes from the first process representation to nodes of the second process representation, wherein the second VAF agent monitors the second process for security exposures;” (supported in paragraph [0026]) and

“in response to the nodes of the first process representation matching nodes in the second process representation, sending an alert from the first VAF agent to the second VAF agent, wherein the alert identifies the illegal interfaces between nodes in the first process representation as potential illegal interfaces between nodes in the second process representation” (supported in paragraphs [0011] and [0026]).

With respect to exemplary new **Claim 22**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “wherein the legal interface further reflects a requisite action in the first node that is required to reach the second node, and wherein the illegal interface further reflects an absence of the requisite action in the first node”, as supported in paragraph [0015] of the original specification.

With respect to exemplary new **Claim 24**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “wherein the legal interface further reflects a requisite return code being transmitted

from the second node to the first node, wherein the requisite return code is transmitted in response to a password being sent from the first node to the second node”, as supported in the original specification in paragraph [0010].

With respect to exemplary new **Claim 25**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest:

“in response to the first VAF agent detecting the illegal interface, creating, by the first VAF agent, a security patch that prohibits the first node from being linked to the second node;” (supported in the original specification in paragraph [0026]) and

“transmitting the security patch from the first VAF agent to the second VAF agent” (supported in paragraph [0026]).

With respect to exemplary new **Claim 26**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “wherein the first process and the second process are component parts of a single distributed software system”, as supported in the original specification in paragraph [0011].

With respect to exemplary new **Claim 27**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “wherein the first process representation and the second process representation are derived from an extensible markup language (XML) description of the respective first process and the second process”, as supported in the original specification in paragraph [0015].

With respect to exemplary new **Claim 28**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “wherein the XML description of the first process is stored in a security server that is protected by a first firewall detection system, and wherein the XML description of the second process is stored in the security server and is protected by a different second firewall detection system”, as supported in the original specification in paragraphs [0013] – [0014] and by elements 112, 114, 120, 122, and 126 in FIG. 1.

With respect to exemplary new **Claim 29**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest “wherein the method described in claim 22 is embodied as an add-on software

component" (supported in the original specification in paragraph [0028]), "the method further comprising:

adding the add-on software component to an enterprise solution before shipping the enterprise software solution to a customer, wherein the enterprise solution is based on the first process", as also supported in paragraph [0028].

With respect to exemplary new **Claim 30**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest "wherein the first VAF agent and the second VAF agent are controlled by a single VAF tool", as supported in the original specification by element 102 in FIG. 1 and in paragraph [0011].

With respect to exemplary new **Claim 31**, a combination of the cited art does not teach or suggest "wherein the first process representation and the second process representation are depicted as graphs", as supported in the original specification by FIG. 2 and in paragraph [0009].

**CONCLUSION**

As the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the pending claims, Applicants now respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone call would be useful in promoting the pending claims to allowance, a telephone call to the undersigned at 512.306.0796 would be greatly appreciated.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 09-0461**.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Boice  
*Registration No. 44,545*  
LAW OFFICE OF JIM BOICE  
3839 Bee Cave Road  
Suite 201  
West Lake Hills, Texas 78746  
512.306.1200

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)